

Applicants assert that Bloomberg does not disclose each and every feature recited in the rejected claims. For example, Bloomberg does not disclose a method of processing image data of a color image for marking, the color image containing overmarked pixels where at least one first color is to be overmarked by a second color, the method comprising *inter alia* generating information that designates the overmarked pixels, performing raster image processing to create raster image data of the color image, the raster image processing including overmarking processing that allows both the at least one first color and the second color to be separately included in the overmarked pixels in the same raster image. Similarly Bloomberg does not disclose a system that processes image data of a color image or marking, as recited in claim 10.

Rather, Bloomberg discloses the capability of selectively placing, on any particular pixel area on a printsheet, CMY colorants, RGB colorants, or one of the black colorants K_1 or K_2 . Assuming that all droplets of every particular color are substantially of the same volume per pixel area, the substitution of a secondary color droplet for two or more primary color droplets per pixel represents a significant saving of colorant placed on the sheet (col. 5, lines 9-19 of Bloomberg). Thus, Bloomberg does not disclose overmarking processing that allows both the at least one first color and the second color to be separately included in the overmarked pixels.

For example, Bloomberg discloses taking one set of colors in a situation where a particular pixel size area in an image to be printed requires a blue color, with the basic CMYK color separations, that pixel area would ordinarily require the combination of cyan and magenta colorant to obtain the desired blue. With the converter of Bloomberg, however, when the situation is detected where a cyan and magenta colorant is required in the same pixel area, the converter 14 will substitute for those two colorants a single droplet of pure blue colorant from the printhead 16 (col. 5, lines 44-53 of Bloomberg).

Thus, Bloomberg actually teaches away from "allowing both the at least one first color and the second color to be separately included in the overmarked pixels in the same raster image" as recited in the rejected claims. Rather, Bloomberg discloses substituting a single color for the two colors that would be required for the pixel. Similarly, Bloomberg also discloses provisions for substituting a process black, indicated as case of one, in those situations where a cyan, magenta and yellow droplets are simultaneously required according to the image data.

As shown in Fig. 2 of Bloomberg, it can be seen that the output line is activated upon receiving a signal on the magenta input line from the green output line. This arrangement makes sense because green is a secondary colorant required by a combination of cyan and yellow; thus, if both green and magenta are required in a particular pixel area, this is in effect the same as saying that all three of cyan, magenta and yellow are required in the pixel area, and, therefore, this would be a situation where the process black K_1 is desired. According to Bloomberg one droplet of process black K_1 will thus be placed in the pixel area in lieu of one droplet each of cyan, magenta and yellow, thus saving two droplets of liquid ink in the pixel area (col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 16 of Bloomberg). Therefore, Bloomberg does not disclose each and every feature recited in the rejected claims.

Furthermore, Bloomberg does not disclose overmarking pixels, but rather merely substitutes one color in place of another. Therefore, Bloomberg does not disclose generating information that designates the overmarked pixels overmarking processing or modifying image data of the overmarked pixels.

The specification defines overmarked pixels as "pixels in which a top color, such as black, is to be marked over any combination of underlying colors, such as cyan, magenta and yellow." Because Bloomberg does not disclose such overmarking, but rather discloses substituting one color or mixture of colors for another color or mixture of colors, then no

overmarking is taking place at all in Bloomberg. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-17, 19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 9, 18, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Bloomberg in view of U.S. Patent 5,731,823 to Miller et al. (hereinafter "Miller"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applications and references will be considered by the Examiner to be owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, the same person at the time the invention was made, if the Applicants or an attorney or agent of record makes a statement to the effect that the application and the reference were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to, an obligation of assignment to the same person (See MPEP §706.02(I)(2)). Applicants submit that as Bloomberg is a valid reference under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and both the Bloomberg reference and the instant application were, at the time the invention was made, owned by Xerox Corporation, the reference is unavailable as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 9, 18, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-22 are earnestly solicited.